

AUG 2 1955

Approved For Release : CIA-RDP70-00058R000100060036-5

Ag 3-1
x - Ag 3 Hogan
x - Socio 4 Russia

LET'S LOOK AT RUSSIA HONESTLY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress in particular, and the American people as a whole are intensely interested in getting every bit of truthful information available concerning the conspiracy of communism which seeks to reduce all the people of the world to a state of abject slavery. This interest has compelled Members of Congress and a large number of citizens to seek valid information concerning the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, its history, its strength, its weaknesses, its vulnerability, the people who populate the vast area which geographers call the Soviet Union, and such other information as may assist us in eliminating those international tensions which now exist and very likely could lead to world war III. Ordinarily the American people would not look to the Central Intelligence Agency to provide public information on the subject matters which I have referred to, because of the character of the work assigned to this Agency by law. However, it appears that the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency was possessed with a desire to tell the American people something about the U. S. S. R. and the people who populate that geographical area and the things they aspire to in the future. I say this because he authored an article which appeared in the Parade magazine section of the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 3, 1955, titled "Let's Look at Russia Honestly." The front page of Parade magazine announced this article by the Director of Central Intelligence Agency as a 4th of July message to the American people, which caused me to give special attention to its contents.

After reading the article by Mr. Allen W. Dulles, I felt compelled to write him a letter on July 6 in which I raised a number of elementary, but fundamental, questions concerning the content of his

August 2

article. I did this because I felt that the public writings of a person in his capacity would have an authoritative effect upon the reading American public. Moreover, since his article seemed to be confused in the usage of political terminology and carried a loose inference that the people of the U. S. S. R. were Russians, with all that implies, I was fearful that the American people would be misled into concepts and beliefs which would prove disastrous to us in the unhappy event of a full-scale shooting war with the leaders of the Kremlin.

I did not have a reply from Mr. Allen W. Dulles to my letter of July 6, but instead one of his assistants telephoned my office to arrange for a discussion of the contents of my letter of July 6. Again I felt the importance which attaches to the article written by Mr. Dulles on July 3, and the questions which I raised in connection with it, required a written answer rather than a conference. I reached this conclusion on the basis that anyone having sufficient time on hand to write an article for a magazine surely would have sufficient time and knowledge of the subject to answer a congressional inquiry.

On July 28, with Congress rapidly approaching adjournment, I had not yet heard from Mr. Allen W. Dulles concerning my letter of July 6 seeking answers to questions which bear upon the public interest and indeed the security of the United States, which caused me to write him another letter requesting that he do me the courtesy of answering my letter before Congress adjourned.

Up until this minute I have not had one word from Mr. Allen W. Dulles, the Director of Central Intelligence Agency, in answer to my letter of July 6, 1955. To me this is a strange performance on the part of the Director of an agency which by law is charged with the responsibility of coordinating, evaluating, and distributing intelligence data affecting the national security. In my considered judgment, the questions which I have raised with Mr. Dulles bearing upon his public writings on the subject of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has a direct bearing on the national security and therefore demands a public answer.

I am herewith making public in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letters of July 6, July 18, and July 28, addressed to Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director, Central Intelligence Agency. I shall make public any and all replies Mr. Dulles gives to the three letters which I am today making public. Likewise I would like to assure Mr. Dulles that I shall continue to seek an answer from him to the questions which I raised in my letter of July 6, 1955.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1955.
MR. ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director, Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: I read your article, Let's Look at Russia Honestly, which appeared in the Parade magazine section of the Washington Post, and as a consequence, have a number of questions concerning the views expressed in your article.

I am sure you will agree that since you direct the work of the Central Intelligence

Agency which, by law, is charged with the responsibility of coordinating, evaluating, and distributing intelligence data affecting the national security, your public writings have an authoritative effect upon the reading public.

Since there is such little valid information given to the American people concerning the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the many nations and distinct people which now comprise it, your analysis of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is especially important, coming as it does at this time.

I am anxious to get all the facts on the heartland of the international Communist conspiracy. Consequently, I would be grateful to you for clarifying the confusion which your article has created in my mind concerning the basic facts as I know them.

In the first place, the terminology of your article uses Russia and the U. S. S. R. interchangeably. Do you regard the U. S. S. R. as Russia, or are you referring to the Russian Federated Socialist Republic which is but one of the many nations within the U. S. S. R.?

Similarly, your article indicates the inhabitants of the Soviet Union are Russians. Are we to understand that all the people of the U. S. S. R. are Russians, or that the superior people of the Soviet Union are Russians as Stalin many times claimed in public statements.

You indicate stresses and strains which the leaders of the Soviet Union must face (a) the agricultural problem; (b) industrialization; and (c) the satellite areas. You omit the tensions created by the struggles of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. against the Russian occupation which, according to sworn testimony before the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, has been a constant and major factor in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkistan, North Caucasus, and in other parts of the Soviet Union.

Several examples of the political importance of the non-Russian nations within the U. S. S. R. can be taken from the fact that Stalin at Yalta claimed that unless membership in the United Nations was provided for Ukraine, Byelorussia and Lithuania, he feared they would attempt to break away from the Soviet Union; in January of last year, on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav, the Russians ordered all their agents and proconsuls in Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union to carry on extensive public ceremonies for a period in excess of six months. The object of these public ceremonies was to acknowledge the national independence of Ukraine while claiming Ukraine to be socialist in substance, to thank the "great Russian brothers" for Ukrainian national independence, and to express the "solidarity" of the non-Russian people with their "great Russian benefactors."

It may be that I do not properly evaluate such situations as I have cited above and I would appreciate having your opinion as to whether the non-Russian nations within the U. S. S. R. do in fact constitute a major internal problem for the Russian Communists.

In enumerating the so-called satellite states, you failed to include Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. I assume, however, that this was an oversight on your part, but if they are considered officially in any other relationship I would be grateful to have you set me straight on this matter.

At several points your article refers to "Soviet people" and I wonder if such a thing really exists. Perhaps you will agree with me that one of the long range objectives of the Kremlin is to create the notion in the free world that there does exist a Soviet man in order that they may com-

pletely discredit any claims of resistance within the Russian Communist empire and to give credibility to the Russian myth that a new type of man has emerged from their socialist experiments. It is important for all of us to know whether the Russians have, in fact, broken the resistance of the non-Russian nations and people they now enslave, and have been able to secure their loyalty and support. If this is your conclusion, I would like to have the basic facts supporting it.

I also notice your article refers to the Soviet Union as a country. It is my understanding that the Soviet Union is made up of many countries, only one of which is Russia, and that each of these countries have a distinctiveness and a separateness which even the Kremlin itself has been forced to recognize.

The House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress described the U. S. S. R. as an empire made up of many once free and independent nations, all of which were the victims of Communist subversion and Russian aggression. This conclusion was based upon the sworn testimony of the most expert witnesses available; former nationals of those once free nations who themselves suffered at the hands of the Red tyrants. In order to properly acquaint the American people with the facts concerning these submerged nations, the committee had prepared a table of Communist aggression which appears on page 44 of its summary report. I would therefore, appreciate receiving from you an official estimate as to whether these submerged non-Russian nations within the U. S. S. R. do constitute a major internal vulnerability or whether their national identities, spirit, and aspirations have been destroyed and replaced with a Soviet civilization.

This may seem a long and detailed letter, but I know you appreciate the importance I attach to the matter your article undertook to analyze. If our people are led to believe that the U. S. S. R. and Russia are one and the same, or that the people who populate the U. S. S. R. are Russians, the way will then be prepared, in the event of an armed conflict with the international Communist conspiracy, for us to make the same political blunders which, in fact, caused the defeat of Hitler on his eastern front. It is my strong personal conviction that the only way we can prevent world war III is by engaging in a political offensive against world communism. Such a political offensive must be very sensitive to the national aspirations of all the enslaved nations and capable of exploiting all the major vulnerabilities of the Russian Communist empire.

Interim Report No. 8 of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression contains most of the sworn testimony on the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. I believe you will find that report throws a sharp light on some basic but little known facts concerning the U. S. S. R. With the hope you will read that report I am enclosing it.

Please be assured that I shall appreciate receiving from you official estimates concerning the above questions.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1955.
MR. ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director, Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: My secretary informed me that on Friday afternoon, Col. Stanley Grogan had telephoned. My secretary also informed me that Colonel Grogan identified himself as your assistant, and stated that in connection with my letter of July 6, instead of getting into a lengthy exchange of com-

1955

munications, that you would prefer to talk over with me the subject matter of my letter of July 6.

For many years, I have devoted a great deal of time and study to the international Communist conspiracy, the many different nations and people which comprise the U. S. S. R., and the important part that Russian imperialism fills in this conspiracy.

This is a subject matter which could consume many hours of discussion and exchange of views. What prompted my writing to you as my letter of July 6 indicates, was the article published under your name in the Parade magazine section of the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 3 titled "Let's Look at Russia Honestly," and my concern lest the views expressed in that article are reflective of the combined opinion of our intelligence agencies and do comprise a part of our established national policy. Consequently, I have reduced my questions to a few in number and have made them as succinct as possible in order to make unnecessary long conferences or lengthy communications.

I am firmly convinced that you, Mr. Dulles, are as vitally concerned as am I, as a Member of Congress, and as an American, that the vast expenditures of public funds for the collection and evaluation of intelligence should put us in a position to know all the facts on the international Communist conspiracy. Moreover, it is my strong personal conviction that it is impossible to assess properly an actual or potential enemy unless we know all his strength and all his vulnerabilities and assess them according to their relative weight.

I am looking forward to receiving your letter in response to my letter of July 6.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1955.

Mr. ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director, Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: On July 6, 1955, I wrote you a letter in which I sought answers to a number of questions growing out of your article, Let's Look at Russia Honestly, which appeared in the Parade section of the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 3.

On July 18 I again wrote to you on the same subject after one of your assistants, Col. Stanely Grogan, had telephoned my office stating that you were in receipt of my letter.

Because of my study of, and my intensive interest in, the international Communist conspiracy, I would greatly appreciate having your answer before Congress adjourns.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

With reference to Mr. Dulles' article—Let's Look at Russia Honestly—and the questions which I raised concerning it, I would like at this point to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an excerpt from a book written by Adm. William H. Standley, and published only a few months ago, titled "Admiral Ambassador to Russia."

Admiral Standley was American Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from February 1942 until the closing months of 1943 when he resigned. On page 507 of this illuminating exposition of Russian Communist behavior, the following verbatim statement appears:

There is nothing new in Russia. Perhaps things are a little worse or a little better for the common man, woman, and child than they were under the czars—but not much.

History teaches that conditions have not changed materially since the 17th century when Peter the Great unified Russia and "liberated" the serf. Russia has always looked outward, has always been expansionist. Possessing one-sixth of the world's surface, she has yet wanted more—an ice-free port on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, control of the Dardanelles, a defensible frontier, security from the barbarians of the north or the south.

Our Minister to Russia in 1852, Mr. Neill S. Brown, has left us this fine diagnosis of Russian imperialism:

"A strange superstition prevails among the Russians, that they are destined to conquer the world, and the prayers of the priests in the church are mingled with requests to hasten and consummate this 'divine mission,' while appeals to the soldiery founded on this idea of fatality and its glorious rewards are seldom made in vain. To a feeling of this sort has been attributed that remarkable patience and endurance which distinguish the Russian soldier in the greatest privations."

Over the ancient skeleton of Russian imperialism, Lenin and Stalin threw a cloak of Communist ideology, but the bones of the skeleton show through. Even as in Czarist times, when the Russian Bear stands on its hind feet with its front paws held up as if in prayer, we must "beware of the bear that walks like a man."

During the past 4 years, we have studied the problem of communism intensively. We have discussed it, read about it, thought about it, worked at it. In the light of the experience with Russian Communist leaders recorded in the foregoing chapters, we have asked ourselves, What is the meaning of communism? To us as Americans? To the world at large? How can our own self-interest, how can the best interests of our country best be served in a world which is an armed camp divided between communism and anticommunism, with the ever-present fear of thermonuclear destruction hanging heavy over our heads? As a challenge, what do we know about communism?

For a program, we must first examine briefly how Russian and international communism got this way.

A year ago Independence Day just past, I was in Munich, Germany, as a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, where we were taking testimony from expert witnesses on the subject of Communist aggression against and occupation of the many once free and independent nations that now comprise the U. S. S. R. While in Munich, I was asked by the director of the Munich Voice of America station to deliver a brief address to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The brief address which I delivered was beamed behind the Iron Curtain in all the foreign languages in which the Voice of America broadcasts to the enslaved people therein. My Fourth of July Independence Day message to all the nations and people enslaved by communism was carried by the Voice of America during a 12-hour period, and since it has a direct bearing on the questions which I have raised in my letters to Mr. Dulles, I believe it is worth while reading at this point:

During the time I have been in Munich, the House Committee on Communist Aggression has devoted eight days to taking testimony on Communist aggression. Although I have made a study of communism, its methods, tactics, and objectives, some of the evidence produced during these hearings was

startling in that it unmasked the terrible brutalities and unbelievable inhumanities committed by the leaders and followers of communism. There can be no doubt but that communism is an international conspiracy which we must either destroy or it will engulf the entire world.

The committee heard eye witnesses to the most terrible crimes ever committed against mankind. These crimes committed by the Russian Communists ranged from the devilish torture of individuals to the brutal and heartless mass destruction of entire nations of people. Other witnesses bore testimony on the manner in which the Communists desecrate and destroy all those things that mankind has labored and died for up through the centuries. In particular, we heard about the tactics the Communists used to violate the integrity of the family and the sanctity of the home, to destroy all the temples of God regardless of the particular belief, the destruction of all laws upon which the order of civilization is based, the gross perversion of historical truths and facts and the climate of fear which the elite leaders of the conspiracy provoke in order to control the people.

All of these crimes when put together present a picture which is the blackest ever known to mankind.

I was particularly impressed with the evidence presented by the spokesmen for the enslaved people of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. This testimony was supported by documents and hard facts and eye witness testimony of the tactics used by the Bolsheviks during the period of 1917 through 1921 to destroy the national independence of some fifteen non-Russian nations. For a great many years Communist propaganda has been seeking to becloud the issue with respect to the national aspirations of the people of these non-Russian nations. The testimony we have received will serve as a death blow to this evil propaganda because it will expose the Soviet Union for what it is—the prison of nations and the ruthless enslaver of all the people under its control. It is my fervent hope that from the testimony taken here in Munich and elsewhere it will be possible for the United States to develop a positive policy, calling for the liberation of all the nations and people enslaved by communism by our firm advocacy of those moral and political principles upon which the American way of life is based. Those moral and political principles are far more powerful in the cause of freedom and justice than are all the armies and destructive weapons known to mankind. But before we can fully use this arsenal for true peace and freedom we must totally discard the morally bankrupt policy of containment and all its advocates.

This is the task that lies ahead for all liberty-loving people. I sincerely believe that the testimony our committee has been receiving from witnesses who know best what communism means and what must be done to defeat it, will make our historic task, as Americans, much easier.

The basic policy of the United States, since the days of its inception has been based upon the political belief that all nations, large and small, have not only the right but also the duty to separate themselves from any tyrannical oppressor. In more recent years we have expressed this policy by our unwavering support of the principle of national self-determination.

This should stand as a beacon of hope to all the enslaved nations of the Communist empire.

I refer particularly to the people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Adzerbaidzahn, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, North Caucasia, and Russia.

11160

Another very pertinent and timely article which should help all Americans to "look at Russia honestly" is one titled "The Russia First Movement in the United States," which appeared in the scholarly Ukrainian Quarterly magazine during the summer of 1953 by an author named Americus. I do urge Mr. Dulles to give this article several careful readings, just as I have urged him to read the 8th interim report and the summary report of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress. Because I feel this article contributes to the strengthening of our national security and throws an illuminating light on a diabolical menace at work within our beloved democracy, I am compelled to read this article in its entirety:

THE RUSSIA-FIRST MOVEMENT IN THE
UNITED STATES
(By Americus)

A few weeks after the inauguration, I visited Washington with the assignment to get a real story on the plans of the new administration to implement its policy of liberation. During the election campaign the containment policy had been fully exposed and identified as both spiritually and intellectually stagnant by the Republicans. The Democrats denied any responsibility for such a policy, stating it never existed as the official policy of the Government and was the result of political misunderstandings and misinterpretations. With both major political parties denying the policy of containment, the American people looked for a positive and dynamic answer to the belligerent threat to all human freedom presented by the Russian Communists. General Eisenhower provided the popular answer when he proclaimed a policy of liberation as the only one that would preserve human freedom and individual liberties in any quarter of the world. This declaration raised the hopes of all mankind, including the millions of people enslaved by the Communists, and was a major factor in bringing victory to the Republican Party. It was only natural that I should be in Washington early, looking for a story on the methods that would be developed to bring about the restoration of national independence and human freedom for the enslaved nations.

After almost a week of effort to get a lead on my story I was about to give up because everyone seemed to be too busy even to hint on how long it would take to develop the new, dynamic policy. It was evident that it would take several more months before the administration would have the reins solidly in hand, with the new policy people placed in all the key positions of control. After making reservations for the trip back home, I began to wonder what my new assignment would be. A last-minute luncheon with an old friend determined my next assignment because it put me on the lead of a story linked with the policy of liberation. Seated at the table next to us were three very serious-looking men. They were talking with such vigor and emphasis that we could not help but overhear their conversation. One of them appeared to be an old Government hand and the other two were obviously newcomers but with definite convictions on what had to be done, and done quickly, if the election promises in the field of foreign affairs were to be accomplished.

The subject of their conversation was the Russia movement and its influence on the foreign policy of the United States. All three were certain that this movement exercised a dangerous influence on the development and exercise of our foreign policy but they were in considerable disagreement on the methods to be used in removing its

roots from the Washington bureaucracy. One held that it would take a full scale congressional investigation to complete the removal. The other two maintained the task could be accomplished by removing the leading advocates from policy positions within the Government, replacing them with people whose first loyalties were to the glorious traditions which form the foundations of our country, and as a consequence the lesser lights would abandon the movement.

Here, in brief, is how they described the Russia first movement and its adherents. The territory of Russia is held to be sacred and inviolate and subject to a dark mysticism which is beyond the comprehension of ordinary Westerners. The Russian people are looked upon as superior with a mission in life to bring the inferior peoples of the world under their domination so that all mankind may advance to a higher civilization. Since the Russian people are imbued with this mystic mission, we of the West must do nothing to offend them because in their hour of world triumph they might become unduly harsh toward those who opposed their self-appointed mission. Moscow is looked upon as the center of a new autocratic paternalism. The despotism and cruel tyranny of Moscow is only temporary since it results from the resistance of the inferior non-Russian peoples to the missionary work of the Russians. All this will end when the mystic mission is completed; the world will then be at peace under the warm paternal protection of Moscow. The ordinary western mind is supposed to be ignorant of the facts concerning the peoples of Russia and their aspirations; therefore, it is the first duty of the movement to make certain they remain in that confused and helpless state.

With this challenging background my curiosity was aroused to a point where I determined my next assignment had to be the Russia first movement in the United States. If the charges were true and the movement had a foothold in and out of government, I had a story better than the one I came to Washington for originally. The policy of liberation would have very tough going if the Russia first movement was as well anchored in the higher echelons of the Government career service as the three narrators maintained. This would mean the administration would have another internal enemy in addition to the Communists and their active sympathizers.

In talks with some of my old friends in the Government career service, my suspicions were further aroused. I hit either a wall of polite silence or obtained small bits of information handed out with the plea "don't quote me and for heaven's sake don't get me involved." Some of the people interviewed suggested I drop my search for a story because the new administration had committed itself against the containment policy and had promised to replace it with one consistent with American principles and ideals. These people held that the spirit of the containment policy was the lifeblood of the Russia first movement and with its demise the movement would die. Others interviewed took the position that the leaders of the containment policy had established a resistance movement in the Government which would fight every move of the administration to develop a dynamic policy and so the Russia first movement would continue to have strong advocates in key career positions. While some very helpful leads were developed in talks with government people, it was most discouraging that few of them would speak freely about the movement, while on the other hand most of them knew about it and despised it.

The second stage of my search took me to the leaders of the World War II emigre groups living in the United States because it was there, I was told, the most current

and complete information would be available. These were the people who had lived under the rule of the Russian Communists and they were sensitive to both its open and hidden tactics. In discussions with these leaders I only confirmed the existence of a Russia first movement but was treated to a liberal education about the many different people who make up the U. S. S. R., the powerful forces within it pulling against the Kremlin and the powder key frailties of the system. The first thing I learned was that there are Russians and non-Russians in the U. S. S. R. The next thing I learned was that the U. S. S. R. was not a nation but an empire made up of many different nations only one of which is Russian in character, language, history, tradition, and aspiration. To my amazement I learned that the Russian people are in the minority in the U. S. S. R. but that they occupy the vast majority of the positions of power and influence under the Communist system. However, the most important thing I learned was that when the Czarist Empire burst at the seams in 1917, the non-Russian nations, held in the slavery of that system for many years declared their national independence and established governments representative of the popular will of the people. This development caused the creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U. S. S. R.) which was nothing but a cover for the Bolshevik army under Trotsky then charged with the task of destroying all these reborn nations and expanding the realm of Marxism.

These are the things I learned from the World War II non-Russian emigres of the U. S. S. R. Over and above this I learned how well organized they are and of their determination to carry on their fight against Moscow. They are violently anti-Communist and intensely loyal to the traditions and institutions most characteristically American. In their eyes the American Declaration of Independence set forth unchangeable principles which today coincide with the aspirations of the enslaved nations within the Communist empire. They are not anti-Russian, but they are dedicated to exposing and destroying Russian chauvinism. Russian chauvinism to them is the same as Nazi superracism, a belief peculiar to the intelligentsia but lacking in mass support, because the masses are the innocent victims of it.

In discussions with the Russian emigres I learned quickly that one must distinguish between the old and the new. The old are those who came to the United States between the great wars but who, nevertheless, are more Russian than anything else. The new are those who suffered under Communist rule and became self-exiled after World War II by refusing repatriation to the U. S. S. R. They are to some degree misfits because they do not understand the unrealistic dreams of the old Russians, and they are groping for a solution to the problem of communism which will forever lift the hand of tyranny from the people. This makes for conflict between the old and the new. It is further aggravated by the old, who insist they know what is best for the newcomers, particularly what they should think and say about the present-day U. S. S. R. But the old have the upper hand, and their voices still speak for all the Russians in the United States.

The Russians take the position that everyone in the U. S. S. R. is a Russian, that is, historically and sentimentally. They speak only about Russia and never about the U. S. S. R. The peoples of their Russia are considered as one happy family, with common bonds uniting them to a common destiny. Their only unhappiness with the U. S. S. R. is with the Communist masters, and they proclaim that once they are removed all will be at peace and harmony within a reborn Russia. When queried about the breakup of czarist Russia following World

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1955

War I and the rebirth of some 16 separate and independent nations, they shrug off this period of history as the consequence of meddling in the internal affairs of Russia by opportunist western politicians. When asked to account for the Independence Day rallies held annually in the United States and in many other parts of the free world by the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Armenians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, and others, the uniform answer given was that they did not represent the aspirations of the people of Russia. It struck me as peculiar that the Russians did not engage in similar independence day rallies, so I inquired as to the reasons for this failure to demonstrate a fervor for national independence. This proved to be a shocking question, because, as I learned later, enlightened nationalism is as much taboo with the Russians as it is with the Communists and the ideological Marxists.

In one rather heated discussion with a Russian group, I was amazed to hear the Ukrainians singled out for special castigation. They were referred to as separatists and in a tone of voice which made it sound like quibbling. This prompted me to ask whether the founding fathers and the signers of declaration of independence were separatists. The astounding answer given was that the declaration of independence had nothing to do with the Russian people and that any effort to apply its principles to Russia would only unite the Russian people with the Communist regime. This struck me as rather strange, because the non-Russian people of the U. S. S. R., who are far more numerous than the Russians, were urging just the opposite position. Could it be true, I asked myself, that the masses of the Russian people would cast their loyalties with the Communists rather than accept a program which would destroy the Communist empire and bring individual freedom to all those enslaved by it?

The third stage of my search led me to the long-established nationality organizations, particularly those dedicated to the task of keeping alive the national heritage of the nations enslaved by communism. This was a stimulating experience. Here were native-born Americans who had spent a lifetime of study and research on the subjects of communism and Russian imperialism. The various people of the U. S. S. R. and their aspirations were well known to these organizations and championed by them. The Russia-first movement was no stranger to them. They all provided me with books, pamphlets, and other materials on the subject and urged me to make a comprehensive study and reach my own conclusions. After several months of research and consultation with specialists on the subject, I have been able to outline the basic form of the Russia-first movement and to distinguish the most important segments of it. For purposes of identification these segments are described as wings because their purposes and activities converge at essential points.

The monarchists: This wing of the movement is dominated by World War I Russian emigres, gullible Americans who have become enchanted by meaningless titles, and some of the business opportunists who can afford to play long shots on futures. The Russian emigres are the hard core of this wing. They carry out the master planning and confusing propaganda work. The Americans attached to this wing serve as window dressing and lend respectability to the master planners. The program of this wing calls for the restoration of the Russian monarchy, maintaining the territorial integrity of the empire, keeping the Russian people in a dominant position over the non-Russian people of the empire and developing an enlightened paternalism as the cohesive force of the monarchy.

The Neo-Marxists: This wing of the movement is made up of Russian emigres and

some ideological differences with the present Kremlin regime, misguided idealists who still believe that utopia is possible and theoreticians who believe that human freedom and individual liberty must be limited by the demands of collectivism. The hard core of this wing are the old Russian emigres whose only quarrel with the present Kremlin regime is that they are better prepared to run the Communist empire. This core is supported by a broad flank of theoreticians, academicians, and foggy idealists all of whom pour out volumes of propaganda in support of Marxist doctrine. The program of this wing calls for the preservation of the territorial integrity of the U. S. S. R., maintaining centralized control over the empire from Moscow, maintaining the dominant position of the Russians because of their natural vent for collectivism and attaining the utopian goal by less severe and more gradual methods than those used by the Communist regime.

The Mensheviks: This wing of the movement is made up of Russian emigres who fled from Moscow after the Bolsheviks took over control of the Russian Federated Socialist Soviet Republic and some poorly informed Americans who still believe the Mensheviks represented a movement of democratic forces supported by a majority of the peoples of old Russia. The advocates of this wing are not numerous but their influence is strong in some important quarters. The program of this wing calls for the preservation of the territorial integrity of the old Tsarist Russian Empire, keeping the non-Russian nations within the Empire and under the dominance of the Russian people and the utilization of a limited popular franchise within a federal system tightly controlled from Moscow.

The Neophytes: This wing of the movement is made up exclusively of Americans with a very limited knowledge of the political stresses and strains within the U. S. S. R. Nevertheless, they enjoy the current status of experts on Russia. When the Russians played their hand too hard following World War II and exposed their plans to dominate the world the clamor went up for experts on Russia. As the tempo of the cold war increased the demand for more and more experts on Russia increased. Classes in the Russian language became a must. Institutes for special study on Russia were developed for the superexperts. In this wild scurry for knowledge the source had to be authoritative so what could be better than old Russian history and technical texts? Little did the unsuspecting scholars know that Russian chauvinism is as old as the Russian written language and as a consequence they were denied their academic freedom. All they were able to learn about the U. S. S. R. and its people was what the Russians have been trying to sell the intellectuals of the world for several centuries. Many of these captive minds give support to the movement by advancing the point of view acquired in this controlled setting.

There are other wings to the movement but to identify them will take more time and additional research. The four wings here described should provide a sufficient base to arouse the interest of American scholars interested in preserving academic freedom. These political wings frequently engage in open controversy over the form of government to replace the Kremlin regime but on one point they are in solid agreement. That point is—Russia must be preserved intact and there can be no interference with the internal affairs of the U. S. S. R. The common efforts of these four political wings form a movement in every sense of that term, dedicated to Russia first.

The champions of the policy of liberation had better keep a sharp eye on the Russia first movement because it is keeping a constant eye on them. The movement has skill, experience, and ability to adapt itself to

fight in the open but as an infighter it is a most dangerous opponent. The outcome of this struggle will determine whether the policy of liberation is to be an unfulfilled promise or a dynamic reality. There can be no compromise between the two conflicting forces. One or the other must win.